Behind the Scenes in Laos, P. 3

Documentary: AAAS Report Condemning Shelter Delusion and Calling for 'Science of Survival', Pps. 2-3

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. X, NO. 1 JANUARY 8, 1962 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Is This How Kennedy Wages A Peace Race?

The new Defense Department pamphlet on fallout protection begins with what might be termed a commercial. "The purpose of this booklet," it says, "is to help save lives if a nuclear attack should ever come to America. The foreign and defense policies of your Government make such an attack unlikely, and to keep it unlikely is their most important aim. It is for this reason that we have devoted so large an effort to creating and maintaining our deterrent forces." This is smooth press agentry for the military, but it hardly fits the testimony in the daily headlines. Our foreign policies keep us on the brink of war in a half dozen far places from Vietnam to Berlin. Our military policies are based upon a nuclear arms race which even many military men agree must lead to a nuclear war. The effect of the pamphlet is to condition the public mind for the disaster these policies make inevitable. In the name of civil defense, our brains are being washed.

A Henry Luce Operation

Even a paper as firmly enlisted in the cold war as the *Baltimore Sun* (Jan. 2) finds that "the tone of the whole booklet, whatever it may say specifically, is to suggest that safety in a nuclear attack is really rather easy and quite neat." The times call for the widest public discussion of the need to end the arms race and create a new world order. Only a few months ago the President was talking of a "peace race." Instead all the facilities of the Defense Department for molding public opinion—it has energetic branches which suggest and arrange stories for TV, the radio, the films, magazines and newspapers—have been put to work since last spring selling the shelter delusion. It is appalling to learn from the *New York Times* (Dec. 31) that the preparation of this fallout pamphlet was originally entrusted to a team from Time, Inc., headed by Edward Thompson, managing editor of *Life Magazine,* which last Sept. 15 published (with an approving letter from Mr. Kennedy) that Pied Piperish sensation "How You Can Survive Fallout. 97 Out of 100 People Can Be Saved." The *Time-Life* crowd is notoriously unreliable as to facts: the home office's capacity for distorting the news it gets from the field is an open journalistic scandal; Henry Luce's crusade for brinksmanship, notably in the Far East, is an old story. It is bad enough that this one man should control so large a sector of American mass communications; it is worse that he is invited in to run a major propaganda campaign for the government.

It is true that the pamphlet prepared by the *Time-Life* team proved to be more than Secretary of Defense McNamara could stomach. It must have been pretty bad if this pamphlet is adjudged a more moderate version. It would be fascinating to know how the skilled *Time-Life* men made more palatable the suggestions in this pamphlet that "the water in toilet flush tanks . . . is drinkable" and that "in an emergency most canned and packaged animal foods can be eaten by humans without harm." Or to see the euphemisms with which they originally veiled the report's lame admission that while "many" of the supposed 50,000,000 shelter spaces to be marked by the National Shelter Survey in existing buildings are in central areas "exposed to destruction by blast and fire in the event of a nuclear attack", this "space is immediately available and the cost of identification, marking and stocking is less than $4 per space." In other words, not worth much but cheap.

From every postoffice the government will now be giving out this pamphlet by the millions. What needs to be driven deep into public consciousness is that there is now no alternative to peace, and that peace requires an end of international anarchy, limitations on national sovereignty and establishment of world law. This pamphlet strives on the contrary to hide from public awareness that war is now obsolete. It admits in passing that "the details of a Civil Defense Program may change with changes in the kinds of missiles that might be used against us," but it never honestly faces up to the implications. The steady growth in the size and number of nuclear missiles may soon make even the best shelter in the most distant area useless for survival. The booklet assumes a 5 megaton weapon when the Russians have already detonated

(Continued on Page Four)

Poll Shows Public Sour on Shelters

A poll by the San Francisco Chronicle in Northern California disclosed: 98% have not built a shelter, 93% don't intend to; 92% are against the government urging all householders to build shelters; 70 percent are against community shelters. Asked: "Do you take the view that life after a devastating nuclear attack would probably not be worth living?" 69% replied "Yes", 23% "No" and 8% were undecided.

In reply to four questions about the potential effectiveness of shelters, 9% thought them essential to national preparedness; 54% thought them "largely useless"; 69% thought them dangerous because "they make nuclear war acceptable by suggesting that they make survival possible" and 72% thought money for family shelters would be better spent "supporting the UN or other peace agencies."

In an editorial Dec. 26, the Chronicle commented, "President John F. Kennedy and others who have evidently concluded that there is political dynamism in the shelter program may well be warned by the preponderant indication that the public is not ready to invest either faith or money in it."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Shelter Delusion Attacked and New "Science of Human Survival" Called For . . .

"War is today a social problem of catastrophic force and overshadowing urgency. The basis of war is power, and power is a product of science. Science is therefore deeply involved in this problem, and scientists have a particular duty toward its solution.

"The destructive power of modern weapons is increasing geometrically. The first nuclear bombs exploded in 1945 released energy equivalent to about 20 tons of TNT. This year 30,000 and 50,000-kiloton bombs were exploded. In the 16 years since, the size of available weapons has about doubled every year.

"One nation arms to deter a possible attack from the other, fearing that these arms may be for aggression rather than defense, the second nation responds by an even greater armament and the process continues. Defensive measures such as shelters follow the same pattern, for they too will tend to elicit a more powerful offense.

Major Cities Doomed

"The immediate destruction expected from a full-scale nuclear war has been the subject of fairly detailed study. It is generally concluded that a massive nuclear attack on the U.S. could destroy most of the nation's major cities. All social and economic processes which depend on large cities would be massively disrupted: communications, transport, finance, a considerable part of light and heavy manufacturing, major medical facilities, centers of government.

"In general, the development of a shelter program cannot greatly influence the conclusion that a massive nuclear attack would have the immediate effect of destroying the social structure. A particular shelter system is designed to resist a certain assumed intensity of attack, and its success depend on the validity of this assumption. But an opponent can be expected to respond to such a defensive move by stepping up the intensity of attack. Any shelter system short of one that places the nation's entire population and industry permanently underground can be negated by a corresponding increase in the attacker's power.

"The long-range problem is vastly more complex than the immediate one. It presents the following general questions: (i) What lasting effects would the great fires and radioactivity have on the biological system (soil, water, air, plants, and animals) on which man depends? (ii) How would the increased death rate, widespread disease, and genetic effects of the war affect the validity and viability of the survivors? (iii) Would the immediate destructive effects of a nuclear war cause major irreversible changes in the economic, social and political organization of our society? (iv) How would the foregoing affects influence the behavior of human beings? The scientific evidence that can be marshaled to answer this formidable array of questions is very limited and uncertain.

"The more complex problems associated with recovery of the economic and social structures following their disruption in a nuclear attack were considered at the Congressional hearings of 1961. Discussion by Sidney G. Winter, Jr., of the Rand Corporation, of the economic recovery problem concluded that sufficient industrial capacity would probably remain after a nuclear attack to support eventual economic recovery; but on questioning it developed that this estimate was basec on the assumption that transportation would be unharmed i the attack.

"The conclusion that economic recovery is feasible was further qualified by the statement that it does not apply 'to possible future situations when extensive blast shelters might be available.' According to this testimony, in a nuclear war that would destroy a given proportion of the nation's industrial capacity, economic recovery would be possible so long as the loss of life in the initial attack would be correspondingly large. If the ratio of survivors to remaining industrial capacity were to become too great, the resulting demand on the limited goods available would be overwhelming and cause a

A Scientific Reply to the Defense Dept.

A few days before the Defense Department released its report on fallout shelters, a quite different report on the problem of survival in the nuclear age was being made to the American Association for the Advancement of Science at its annual meeting in Denver. This more somber and honest but inspiring report was by the AAAS Committee on Science in the Promotion of Human Welfare. It is a pity that this, too, is not available at every postoffice in mass reprint. We present an abridged version here; the full text can be read in Science (Dec. 29). The report was prepared by Barry Commoner, Washington University; T. C. Byerly, Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture; Lawrence K. Frank, Belmont, Mass.; H. J. Geiger, School of Public Health, Harvard University; Margeret Mead, American Museum of Natural History; and Frank W. Notestein, Population Council, Inc. Those who would like more people to see this report by distributing reprints of this issue can obtain them at 3 cents each in lots of 100.

East and West Pretend They Do Mankind A Favor by Resuming Nuclear Tests

"The attempt on the part of the United States and some other Western powers to use, for the purposes of undermining confidence in the Soviet Union, the nuclear weapons tests which our country had to carry out in response to the military threats of the NATO block, were of no avail.

"All the nations to whom the cause of peace and security of peoples is dear—and they account for the overwhelming majority in the United States—could not but understand and recognize that the growth of the Soviet Union's might consolidated the international positions of the USSR and the whole of the socialist camp, and consequently the cause of peace and security of all the peoples."

—V. A. Zorin, Soviet delegate to the UN, statement on the General Assembly session, Dec. 22.

"Washington, Dec. 23—U.S. officials appeared today to be shifting to the view that world public opinion should not be a bar to resumption of nuclear tests in the atmosphere if they are considered a military necessity.

"The Administration is turning to the belief that a resumption of nuclear tests might be welcomed by many foreign nations, including neutralist countries.

"Official sources here, reviewing the policy on nuclear testing in the light of the conference in Bermuda this week between President Kennedy and Prime Minister Macmillan, said that although many people might oppose a resumption of tests by the U.S., others would regret it if the tests were not renewed."

—New York Times dispatch, Dec. 24.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

...In Historic Report to the American Association for the Advancement of Science

general failure of social organization.

"In a piecemeal treatment of recovery from nuclear war, separate problems appear to be soluble just because they are artificially isolated from the web of interconnections that distinguishes the complexity—and the actuality—of society, an illusion that is dispelled when the fragment is restored to its proper place in the whole. If we consider in its entirety the problem of recovery from, nuclear war, there is, we believe, no scientific basis at present for a useful prediction of what kind of society—if any—would emerge from the ruins. If society embarks on the path of nuclear war, science cannot now offer enlightenment on the end result.

"We must conclude that society can no longer be defended by an unlimited war. If we permit such a war to occur in the future course of human history, we run the risk of ending human history altogether. Peace, which was until now a human *want*, has become a human *need*.

—Abu, in The Observer (London) Dec. 24.

The Responsibility of Science

"We believe that science has a commanding responsibility to help mankind survive. Whether society shall continue to rely on war—which is now so dangerously unfit for its protective function—is a social decision. If this crisis is to be resolved by rational social action, the public must become aware of it. To acomplish this educational task, scientists will need to overcome certain difficulties. One problem is to remove the obstacles which now tend to obstruct the flow of technical information to the scientific community. Much of the information about war is not easily accessible. It often appears in special reports which rarely find their way into the scientists' libraries.

"Another difficulty is caused by the political tension that is naturally associated with the problems of war and peace. Any scientific finding about these issues is almost certain to be construed as supporting some political beliefs and contradicting others, and there may be a tendency to social pressure against the scientist who attempts to disseminate it. Such constraint is a hazard to the rational development of social decisions. If scientists have the obligation to inform their fellow citizens about grave issues, citizens have a reciprocal duty to defend the scientists' right to be heard without prejudice.

"We believe that if the complexity of the problem is not only recognized but accepted in advance as inescapable, it can be solved. In the past, the physical, biological and social sciences have been separated by their reliance on different approaches. Today, to meet the new needs of the entire human species the concepts and methods of all the sciences must be combined. We can then hope to devise new social inventions to protect all mankind from self-destruction.

"Are these hopes unreal? Despite its formidable complexity and close association with deeply held social ideas, the problem of modern war is of a type that is not wholly new to science. In a certain sense the present problem resembles the historical crisis due to the impact of Darwinism on Victorian society—or of the Copernican revolution on the medieval views of man and the universe. In these historical trials the views fostered by science finally prevailed.

"We call for the establishment of a new collaborative science, the science of human survival, which will apply the full strength and wisdom of all the sciences to the solution of the crisis created by the obsolescence of war.

"The great changes that science has made in the human condition form a procession of present accomplishments that yesterday were only fantasies and dreams. This history gives us hope that science can help mankind realize tomorrow what is today the dream of peace."

French Correspondent Lifts the Curtain on Why Peace Talks in Laos Broke Down

"Vietiane, Laos, Dec. 30 (AP)—The fiasco of Laos's three Princes' summit left a harvest of criticism in Vientiane today that the U.S. had not applied itself forcefully enough to making the meeting a success. . . . Diplomats from some other countries, such as Britain, France, and India, believe that the Boun Oum [rightist] government is unwilling to yield any of its power. As to whether the Americans might have pressed Boun Oum harder to go into a bargaining session, U.S. Embassy sources said Ambassador Winthrop Brown had made it perfeetly clear to the government that the U.S. supports a policy of Laotian neutrality through an acceptable coalition government."

—Baltimore Sun, Dec. 31, 1961.

'There persists in Laos the most amazing situation in contemporary diplomacy. While at Geneva the delegates of fourteen Powers including Communist China try patiently to make possible the reunification and neutralization of this little Kingdom, and while at Vietiane American and Soviet representatives work together to obtain the cooperation of the three Princes representing pro-West, neutral and pro-Communist tendencies, a little group of Laotian officers led by General Phoumi Nosavan [Boun Oum's] Minister of Defense and supported by some U.S. and Thai agents and military men, 'gum up the works.'

"Almost every morning, the U.S. Ambassador, M. Brown, visits General Phoumi to persuade him to accept the formula of a coalition with the Communists, which is alone capable of permitting reunification of the country and reestablishment of peace. Every evening, an expert of MAAG [the U.S. military advisory group in Laos] or of the Central Intelligence Agency comes to cheer up the General and incite him to oppose any entry of Reds into the government."

—Le Monde (Paris) Dec. 17-18, 1961, in a series of on-the-spot reports from Indochina.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Are We Ready To Practice What We Preach to Nehru?

(Continued from Page One)

a monster more than 10 times that size, and claim to have 100-MT bombs. The booklet assumes a fall-out producing ground burst when it is quite possible to maximize blast and fire effects and eliminate local fallout by exploding bombs at high altitudes. A 100 MT bomb (as *Consumer Reports* for January points out) would then set afire an area as large as Vermont, and a 1000-MT bomb would "easily do the same for an area equivalent to the states of New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania all put together."

The Upper Limit of Civil Defense

Even elaborate shelters with their own air and water supplies, sealed off from fire, deep enough to survive blast, somehow able to guarantee exit from under tons of rubble, would still be unable to guarantee survival in the permanently scarred and poisoned landscape thermonuclear weapons are able to create. Harrison Brown at Denver last week estimated that U.S. and Russian stockpiles now contain 60,000 megatons of TNT equivalent. Ralph Lapp estimated last year that an attack which dropped little more than one-tenth this amount on the U.S. could hopelessly poison our croplands. The Soviet farmlands are equally vulnerable. Dr. Lapp calculated an attack of 7500 megatons (40% of it fission products) would render the U.S. unliveable. There is an upper limit of attack beyond which no civil defense is possible because the earth itself would be too poisoned radioactively to feed those left to live upon it. This level of attack is below the amounts in stockpile and within the delivery power on both sides.

During the holidays there was a burst of self-righteous indignation over India's forcible reconquest of Goa. But the real lesson has not sunk in. Each nation, in a world without law, is a law unto itself. For each the end justifies the means. Wherever an evil seems insufferably bad, the right to resort to war against it is taken for granted. We criticize India and the Afro-Asians generally for feeling that way about colonialism. But we feel and act the same way about communism, and the Soviet states behave likewise when confronted by what they call capitalist imperialism. What Nehru did in Goa was less reprehensible than the secret conniving at war against Cuba by our government which has just been disclosed by the President of Guatemala. If Nehru doesn't practice what he preaches neither do we and neither does the Kremlin. The truth is that, as in civil life, the welfare of the world community demands the elimination of the habit of taking the law into one's own hands. No evil is so great as to justify resort to war, for war may mean the end of all civilization. No dispute is so sacred that it should not be subjected to arbitration by independent organs of the world community. As Bertrand Russell said in his latest book, "Has Man A Future?", "War has so long been a part of human life that it is difficult for our feelings and our imaginations to grasp that the present anarchic national freedoms are likely to result in freedom only for corpses." It is this exercise in objectivity, it is this conditioning for universal perspectives, that our people need if our country and the world is to be saved, not a pamphlet propagating the delusion that we can play with thermonuclear fire and survive as a nation.

Like Betting on the Horses

"To be blunt about it, fallout shelters of the type widely proposed to date are so costly and complex in their requirements, so limited and unreliable in usefulness, and so generally dependent on variables and unknowns, that there is very little which an organization like Consumers Union can do by way of evaluating them. . . .

"The family shelter . . . is purely and simply a bet, exactly like a bet on a horse race. The shelter owner gambles (like the track bettor) that a complex set of variables will so arrange themselves that his shelter (or his horse) will come through. There is assuredly no sharing of the risk, and there isn't the shadow of an actuarial basis. The one with the most money can build the best shelter, and survival with a shelter comes high: the odds on a $5,000 bet are unquestionably better than the odds on a $500 bet, which is about all the advice CU can give in this gambling area."

—The Fallout Shelter: Consumer Reports (Jan. 1962) prepared by Dexter Masters CU's Director.

Holiday Gift Rates Remain in Effect But Only Till End of January

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

1/8/62

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except the last Monday in August and the first in September and the last Monday in December and the first in January at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED